

SECRET

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100020008-2

BI-WEEKLY PROPAGANDA GUIDANCE

RECORD
COPY

NUMBER 47

DATE: 29 August 1960

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 281. The New History of the CPSU or History
ala Khrushchev
- 282. UN General Assembly
- 283. Togliatti on the Non-inevitability of War
- 284. Yugoslav Criticism of Chinese Policy and
Ideology
- 285. Chinese Representation in the United
Nations

25X1C

Approved For

SECRET

August 1960

281. The New History of the CPSU or History ala Khrushchev

Communist Parties everywhere for many years have based all indoctrination programs for party members on the history of the CPSU -- and only to a lesser extent on the history of their own party. Dialectical materialism -- or, the materialist concept of history -- is a key factor in Marxist-Leninist doctrine. Publication of a new history of the CPSU is therefore far more significant than the appearance of many other Communist writings. The new History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, published in June 1959, takes the place of The Short History of the CPSU, authorship of which was claimed by Stalin. Stalin's version, which was found satisfactory from 1938 to 1953, had been preceded by several others, each rejected as circumstances demanded. The new history of the party is not expected to outlast the rule of Khrushchev, and a new gap may again develop, as from 1953 until 1959, when there was no "official" history of the Party. The latest version of Party history is characterized, as were its predecessors, by dullness, omission of major events which affected the Party, and new estimates of the heroes and the villains. The purges of the thirties, in which Lenin's close associates were liquidated, are almost completely passed over in silence. The October Revolution and the Civil War are described without mentioning the name of Trotsky. Molotov and Malenkov are mentioned only as members of the anti-Party group, eliminated in 1957. Stalin, denounced by Khrushchev in his secret speech in 1956, again appears as the great leader who, unified the Party by eliminating the opposing groups, launched the USSR on the road of industrialization, collectivized agriculture, and "liberated" the people of Eastern Europe, China, North Korea and Vietnam. Khrushchev's name appears late in the new history, but in the last chapter, covering the 21st Party Congress, he alone occupies the whole stage.

Guidance

25X1C10b

29 August 1960

The 15th regular session of the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), opening 20 September in New York, will be the first major world-wide diplomatic meeting since the Soviets wrecked the Summit meeting in Paris and walked out of the Geneva disarmament talks. Khrushchev may appear with the Soviet delegation, hoping to dominate proceedings alone, possibly with a new version of his "universal disarmament" plan, presumably combined with blaming the US for aggressiveness and with a strong pose as champion of the underdeveloped and newly independent nations, perhaps keyed to the Congo crisis. Admission of new members, raising UN membership from the present 82 to a possible 98 nations (all newcomers, except Cyprus, are newly independent African countries) will shift voting strength in UNGA farther away from the West and towards the newly independent nations, uncommitted in the East-West conflict. Formation of an African Bloc as a sub-group of the Afro-Asian Bloc may be expected. Latin American bloc voting may be impaired by Cuba and the Dominican Republic (the latter's delegation presumably headed by Generalissimo Trujillo). Attempts to admit Communist China can be expected to be reiterated, though the Communists themselves doubt whether India, aggrieved by Chicom border violations and hostile propaganda, will again sponsor such a move. Elections of 4 non-permanent members of the UN Security Council, of 6 members of the Economic and Social Council and of 5 judges for the International Court of Justice may become another test of relative strength between the blocs. Changes in the overall number of seats in the Security Council and other UN organs, to reflect the rapid increase in membership, may be proposed, but are not likely to be adopted. Apart from disarmament and the general state of the Cold War, controversial subjects likely to be debated at UNGA include also: the Congo crisis, Cuba, the Algerian conflict (possibly involving demand for a UN-supervised referendum or plebiscite), apartheid in the Union of South Africa, regulations concerning Outer Space, Hungary, Tibet, the German-speaking minority in South Tyrol (Italy), and perhaps other issues.

25X1C10b

Guidance

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100020008-2

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100020008-2

It is common practice for a Communist state to interpret Marxist-Leninist theory in a manner providing maximum ideological support for the policies which its current national interests dictate. Differences in interpretation of ideology, therefore, represent far more than academic arguments regarding the proper interpretation of Marx and Lenin, since they frequently evidence a conflict of national interest which the Communists feel obliged to justify ideologically. These divergent interests are the outgrowth of historic, political and economic factors which dictate a particular basic strategy as being the most useful not necessarily for the advance of international communism, but for the national interests of the country involved. It is in this light that the present controversy between the USSR and China over Marxist-Leninist theory on the "inevitability of war with imperialism" should be considered. The Soviet Union, on the one hand, which has much to lose from a nuclear war, calls upon Marx and Lenin to justify its policy of relaxation, peaceful coexistence and disarmament. The national interests of Communist China, on the other hand, require the ever-present specter of capitalist aggression in order to maintain the "enthusiasm" of the populace at fever pitch and to squeeze every last measure of work out of the Chinese people. Thus, it uses Marxism-Leninism to justify a hostile, belligerent and provocative foreign policy. At a secret meeting of Communist leaders in Bucharest, following the Rumanian Party Congress in July, Sino-Soviet differences on this subject were discussed by Khrushchev with Communist delegates from all over the world. After censuring the Chinese views, Khrushchev instructed the Communist leaders to discuss the controversy with their respective Central Committees and to report their conclusions. One of the most illuminating commentaries on the controversy has been provided by Palmiro Togliatti, Secretary General of the Italian Communist Party (PCI) in his speech to the Central Committee (reported in the party organ L'Unita of 24 July under the heading "Today It is Possible to Avoid War and Attain Socialism by Peaceful Means". Togliatti's remarks constitute a detailed expose and vigorous corroboration of Khrushchev's views as well as an implicit condemnation of the Chinese position. Moreover, originating as they do with the leader of the Free World's largest and most powerful Communist party, who is known to sympathize with Khrushchev's program, and devoted as they are to international affairs and to inter-party differences rather than to matters of internal Italian politics, Togliatti's views must be considered to be consonant with those of Khrushchev himself. (NOTE: On 30 July Moscow's Chinese-language broadcast transmitted a 500-word summary of Togliatti's speech.) Regarding the dispute on the "inevitability of war", the Italian Communist leader makes two basic arguments: a) the nature of warfare has changed (the fact that in any nuclear conflict both sides would suffer total destruction impels one to consider other criteria than those concerning the just or unjust nature of the war; one would be lying to the people if one said it were possible today to attain socialism by means of war); b) the change in the balance of power between socialism and imperialism in favor of the former makes it possible to gain independence and create a socialist state without resorting to war - even civil war; thus, the correct means to be employed in these new conditions are the manipulation of public opinion and the isolation and division of the imperialists). The speech is remarkable, however, not only for the detailed exposition of the assumptions underlying Soviet policy but for a number of other implications. Pre-Summit objectives have been

283. (Cont.)

examined and found not only still to be valid (since the objective conditions to which they relate remain in force), but "even more compelling than before". The Summit breakdown is characterized as the result of "an acerbated situation", which, in itself, contributed to the "further acerbation of East-West relations". The conclusion: first and foremost, "conditions must be created for the reconvening of the Summit Conference". The recurrent theme of the destructive power of modern weapons would appear to indicate that the speaker (and, by extension, his mentor in the USSR) is aware of the risks involved in modern warfare and the consequences a nuclear conflict would have for the future of socialism. "Peace is a vital objective for the working class now that it has come into power" (obviously Togliatti is not referring to the working class in Italy). Khrushchev's ideas about the need to update and re-interpret Marxism-Leninism are also echoed in Togliatti's speech. There are several references to the "fundamental difference in the conditions which obtain today as opposed to those which were valid 50 years ago", as well as those who "refer to judgments made a half a century ago" in order to support their views. Togliatti's total and unequivocal support of Khrushchev's position is the latest and most explicit manifestation of Khrushchev's insistence that in this internecine dispute, Communist parties everywhere "stand up and be counted". It constitutes another indication of how important Khrushchev considers this dispute with the Chinese and - very possibly - his concern that those who "today question and criticize these theses (i. e., peaceful coexistence, detente, disarmament, etc.) and would like to set them aside" are causing the Soviet leader considerable trouble. Togliatti's speech provides additional evidence that Khrushchev, despite his recent anti-Western campaign, has not abandoned his long-cherished program of "peaceful coexistence", and that a showdown with the Chinese and the bloc hardliners is occurring at the present time.

25X1C10b

Guidance

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100020008-2

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100020008-2

On 12 August 1960, the Yugoslav newspaper Borba began publishing in serial form a dissertation of Edvard Kardelj, Vice President of the Federal Executive Council and leading Yugoslav theoretician, entitled Socialism and War. Kardelj sets as his objective to determine the essence of current Chinese policy and its ideological basis. He proposes two main questions: do Chinese concepts of international affairs derive from socialism and Marxism? And, what are the consequences of these concepts? The answers, which are advanced in the form of a dispassionate Marxist analysis, constitute a devastating critique of Chinese foreign policy. First of all, according to Kardelj, Chinese diatribes against Yugoslavia represent not so much an attack on one small socialist country as an attempt to bring political pressure on the international policy of all those socialist states which do not share China's foreign policy views. The strategic Chinese objective is to subordinate the entire policy of international socialism (i. e., communism) to its own views and to the interests on which those views are based. Arguing from a pedestal of infallibility and an arbitrary interpretation of Marxism, the Chinese characterize themselves as "radical revolutionaries" and the rest of the socialist camp as "opportunists". Kardelj warns the Chinese that the days of the "great wise man" Stalin, who distributed the "truth" from monopolistic heights, are gone and adds that it will be to the detriment of the Chinese Communists if they assume Stalin's discredited historical heritage. Kardelj emphasizes that the positive and creative factors of the Chinese revolution obtain as long as the revolution is centered upon itself, but turn into a definite form of hegemony once the revolution endeavors to impose itself by force or by political pressure. The Chinese criticism of Yugoslavia is actually a hypocritical attempt to assume the mantle of the defenders of "true" Marxism, in order to disguise its own social reality and its own problems. Kardelj considers it Yugoslavia's task to expose and reject the hegemony hiding behind the slogans of revolution, just as it rejects the hegemony of the vestiges of imperialism, since every hegemonic tendency is contrary to the basic interests of world socialism. Rather than a democratic solution of differences, the makers of Chinese policy demand subservience. Under the guise of being the authoritative interpreters of "true" Marxism, the Chinese leaders are attempting to force their concepts of socialist international policy on others, a policy resulting from particular Chinese social conditions and political tendencies generated by these conditions. These concepts are not in keeping with the ideological aims of socialism. In general, any attempt to turn "radicalism" into an absolute principle is a symptom of an unhealthy ideological condition. Such an attempt is absurd, because it is based not on a realistic analysis of objective conditions but on an abstract ideological hypothesis and on wishful thinking. Kardelj recalls that in the history of the labor movement, pseudo-revolutionary radicalism caused considerable damage. The real criterion by which Chinese "ultra-radicalism" should be judged is whether it strengthens or weakens socialism and other progressive forces. Concerning the key question of the inevitability of war, Kardelj states that the world socialist revolution is not evolving like trench warfare but as an organic social process in which revolutions and revolutionary, anti-colonial war combine with evolution, i. e., with the process of peaceful political struggle and gradual conquest of political power by socialist and other progressive forces. The

284. (Cont.)

Chinese, who deny the possibility of coexistence and foresee the outbreak of world war, confuse the problem of international war with that of revolution and civil war in order to prove, unconditionally, that any war which a socialist country undertakes against another country is a revolutionary war. The equation of international class struggle with the inevitability of war is obviously a distortion of Marx's teaching concerning class-social struggle. Once a country rejects the view that the process of revolution entails the revolutionary solution of internal social contradictions through the internal forces of the society itself and begins to confuse revolution with international war, it inevitably runs the risk of claiming as a form of world revolution what is really a war of conquest. The Chinese theoreticians are mistaken if they think that such a war would be welcomed by the working class in the capitalist countries. They are inclined to force socialist revolution into artificial and subjective theoretical molds, leading to external adventurism and, internally, to a form of bureaucratic state socialism. Finally, Kardelj characterizes the dilemma which socialism faces today regarding its further development as a world system as: whether the controversy between socialism and capitalism must inevitably be solved through a new world war or whether it can be solved by a process of internal social movements in individual countries. Kardelj believes there is only one conclusion to this dilemma which is in accordance with Marxism and with the humanistic spirit of socialism: "If there are ways short of war to settle these contradictions, the socialist forces can and must pursue a policy of peace and coexistence." Mr. Kardelj's treatise represents the most explicit articulation of Yugoslav views on the correct path for socialist development. However, since the timing of the publication can hardly be regarded as accidental, we can assume it also represents Tito's contribution to the dispute currently raging in the Communist world which - in the guise of deciding which interpretation of Marx-Lenin on the "inevitability of war" is the correct one - will determine whether the Soviet or the Chinese tactics will serve as the model for future Marxist development. In comparing the Yugoslav arguments with those advanced by the USSR and its apologists, we must remember that in an era when Stalinist absolutism is no longer possible, Khrushchev is obliged to reconcile divergent opinions within his own party - to say nothing of such "conservative" comrades as Ulbricht, Novotny and - of course - Mao himself. Tito, operating under no such handicap, has advanced with Kardelj's treatise on Socialism and War, a most original and far-reaching analysis of the current course of socialist development, an analysis which, once again, will allow the Yugoslavs to claim that, in matters of ideology, the USSR is actually following the Yugoslav lead.

25X1C10b

Guidance

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100020008-2

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100020008-2

In September, the question of Chinese representation in the United Nations is expected to be raised once more in the General Assembly. Last year, 44 member nations supported the US position by voting for a moratorium on the issue, 29 voted against a moratorium, and 9 nations abstained. Of the 82 member nations in the UN, 41 recognize the Government of the Republic of China (GRC), 30 recognize Communist China, and 8 recognize neither. (The GRC, Byelorussia, and the Ukraine have been excluded from these figures.) Of the twelve free countries of the Far East other than the GRC, only three have diplomatic relations with Communist China. Neither the GRC nor Communist China accept the "two Chinas" concept. Therefore, the question of seating both in the UN is without validity at present. Each claims to be the sole representative of the entire Chinese people. The GRC is a charter member of the UN and has lived up to the principles of the UN Charter. Communist China committed aggression against UN forces in Korea. Membership in the UN and a seat on the Security Council would provide Communist China with the opportunity to thwart further the UN objectives and to extend its influence in all areas of the world. To accept claim that Taiwan is part of Communist China's domain. Even neutral countries of Asia, which are particularly anxious to see a peaceful settlement of the potentially dangerous Taiwan Straits situation, no longer believe that Taiwan, where the Taiwanese, as well as the mainland refugees, are strongly anti-Communist, should be handed over to the Communists. From the standpoint of the entire free world, there are several practical reasons for supporting of the international position of the GRC. The GRC is at present the only practical rallying point for anti-Communist Chinese, both those on the mainland and those overseas. The very existence of a free China must provide moral support for dissident elements on the mainland, and this is a major reason why the GRC's existence is such an irritant to the Chinese Communists. For the overseas Chinese, Nationalist China is the stronghold of Chinese cultural traditions, which have been completely destroyed on the mainland. Increasing numbers of overseas Chinese are travelling to Taiwan for their education, while fewer are going to Communist China. During the last ten years, the GRC has acquitted itself well in its administration on Taiwan. Its land reform program, under which 81 percent of the farmers are tilling their own land, could serve as an example to all underdeveloped countries. The industrial economy of Taiwan has continued to expand, as have exports of manufactured goods. The per capita national income has increased, even though the population is increasing by 3.5 percent each year. Despite heavy outlays for defense, the standard of living on Taiwan is now one of the highest in the Far East. 95 percent of school-age children are in school. The Taiwanese have been given self-government at the county and municipal levels.

25X1C10b

Guidance



25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100020008-2

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100020008-2

Attachment to Item #283

UNCLASSIFIED

29 August 1960

Speech of Palmiro Togliatti, Secretary General of the Italian
Communist Party, to the Central Committee as it
appeared in the Party organ l'Unita 24 Jul 60

Concerning the debates which are going on at the present time, I believe they must be examined from the point of view of an exact comprehension of the present international situation.

There are many inter-related elements in the present international situation, elements which differ one from the other and are in part contradictory. There is no doubt that we are confronted with a definite, renewed aggressiveness of American imperialism which, by the aggressive U-2 incident, which violated the borders, the air space and the territory of the Soviet Union, made the long awaited Summit Conference impossible. A similar incident followed when another war plane was also shot down by Soviet defenses. This means that the leaders of American imperialism are not abandoning a line of conduct which is contrary to a detente in international relations, and that it openly aims at aggravating relations with the socialist countries and particularly with the Soviet Union. This is one element of the situation, and an extremely troubling one. Moreover, American imperialist aggression manifests itself in a particularly violent form against the People's Republic of China. Following the breakdown in Paris, President Eisenhower has not hesitated in exhuming the provocative language of the former Secretary of State, J. Foster Dulles, speaking of "eight million men" in the socialist countries who are allegedly "deprived of the innumerable blessings of the progress of freedom", of those blessings that is, which the workers enjoy under capitalist oppression. Those words of the American President in the light of the facts of Korea, Turkey and of Japan made the whole world laugh. However, they are definite indications of the return to the spirit of the Cold War.

The situation in the Far East around the borders of China has become particularly acute and it is impossible not to take this fact into consideration in discussing the problems which we face today.

Also very serious is the fact that the aggressive activities of American imperialism have been supported by the great western powers, even when, as in the case of the violation of Soviet air space, its culpability was evident. Not only the Germany of Adenauer - which was to be expected - but also Italy, France, and even England did not dare to condemn their ally. This solidarity was shown also at the disarmament conference which was obliged to suspend its activities because of American excesses. Instead of taking measures for disarmament, the United States, as was announced today, is supplying atomic weapons to Bonn and in this way new incendiary war materiel is accumulating in a world already overburdened with them.

Another acerbating factor of the same type and for which the large imperialist powers are also responsible, is the aggressive posture toward the people who at this moment are winning and affirming their independence and sovereignty and who are seeing it seriously menaced by the enemy of all liberty, imperialism. Thus, the problem of Cuba arose and, at the present time, the serious problem of the Congo where the stage of military activities has already been reached, activities which could spread to other parts of the African continent.

To those acerbating factors, however, are juxtaposed others which act in an opposite manner. In the first place, we must take into consideration the

(More)

UNCLASSIFIED

Attachment to Item #283 (Cont.) UNCLASSIFIED

continued progress of the socialist world, the economic strengthening of the Soviet Union and of all the socialist countries, and, among other things, the practical demonstration of Soviet military superiority as well, which is shown by the way in which the two planes sent by the United States on aggressive missions were shot down. Beyond doubt, these airplanes represent the apogee of American military science. I have seen the remains of the U-2 in the Park of Culture in Moscow and this is what impressed me the most: the technical perfection of the apparatus, the extreme lightness of the metal, the quantity and complexity of machinery contained in the most limited space which allow it to fly and function at an altitude of 15,000 meters. Well, this dreadful and highly perfected military machine was easily shot down. This represents a new, and clear demonstration of the superiority of the socialist world and in particular of the Soviet Union since it shows its ability to repel any attack, to crush any aggressor. This has acted as a salutary cold shower on the hot heads of imperialism.

At the same time, throughout the world, the fighting intervention of countless masses of people has been manifested in those very countries which, according to President Eisenhower, enjoyed "the blessings of the progress of freedom". Entire peoples have rebelled, demonstrated, and won those victories well known to all of us.

As you see, we are faced with profound differences, with contradictory factors which are developing simultaneously. The future of the world depends on whether one of the other of these elements prevails.

In this situation, and particularly after the Paris breakdown, do the objectives which we set before the Summit remain valid or not, and what value and content do they assume? This is the question that a large portion of the workers' movement asked itself following the Summit and which a section of our party also asked. We have given our reply, an equitable reply. The objectives of our struggle remain because the conditions in which the objectives were set have not changed. On the contrary, today they are even more urgent and more necessary than yesterday. The very manifestations of American imperialist aggressiveness should oblige us to consider detente, disarmament and peace as objectives for which we must struggle more intensely than before. However, we must realize that something serious has happened. The Summit collapse is not a fact which can be obscured. It was the result of an acerbated situation and at the same time it contributed to the acerbation. Above all, we cannot forget that the solidarity of the Atlantic powers with the US has relegated to second place those indications favorable to the detente which had been manifest by certain leading groups in the capitalists states of Western Europe.

What was the main objective we set before Paris? It was that a Summit Conference take place to discuss the most serious problems facing the world and to make decisions and take measures which would create a detente and bring the world nearer to peaceful coexistence; as well as to initiate a general, effective and controlled disarmament. Now, it is clear that these objectives remain; but it is just as evident that today one must create the conditions in which they can be attained. While previously it appeared that, with the exception of Adenauer's Germany, the Western governments had accepted the need for a Summit Conference, this suddenly became impossible. Therefore, a new struggle is necessary; to create the conditions in which a Summit Conference can be convened and perform a useful function. Renewed pressure of public opinion upon the governments of the principal capitalist countries is required to make them condemn the

(More)

Attachment to Item #283 (Cont.) UNCLASSIFIED

American aggressors, to break their solidarity with them, to take concrete steps for a return to the detente and, as a first step, for a new convocation of the Summit Conference.

However, our objectives have been and are of longer range and it is on these that the discussion centers. That which we propose by our struggle for peace, for detente, and for peaceful coexistence and for disarmament is to make impossible the outbreak of a new war. This is not all. We affirm at the same time that this is a real objective and not merely a propaganda objective; i. e., we affirm that war can be avoided.

This thesis which was received and greeted as correct by the entire workers movement was developed at the 20th CPSU Congress, and confirmed by the November 1957 Declaration and by the decisions of the 21st CPSU Congress. Our party developed this thesis in the decisions of its 8th and 9th Congresses. Today this thesis has been brought up again for debate. Those who criticize it and would like to set it aside appeal to judgments which were made around 50 years ago, according to which imperialism is a permanent cause of war since it tends to use violence to assert its own world domination, to enslave people's and to resolve, through war, the problem of the division of the world among different rival capitalist groups. These judgments are based on a precise knowledge of the nature of imperialism and therefore remain valid even in the present situation. The nature of imperialism has not changed today. Imperialism continues to resolve international problems by war and to provoke wars, without regard for the victims, the catastrophies and the tremendous destruction of wealth which are its consequences. The universal aspect of the last world wars, which occurred within little more than 20 years of one another, comes from the nature of imperialism.

However, if imperialism continues to be what it was, this does not mean that one can act today as one acted before. A bandit is always a bandit. However, if he is handcuffed he can no longer kill. Therefore, we must see whether or not there have been induced changes in the present situation which no longer permits to foment war.

The situation in which we find ourselves is profoundly different from what it was 50 years ago. We no longer live only in the era of imperialism. We live in an era in which socialism is proving itself and advancing from victory to victory.

Now, for us an essential principal of political, strategic and practical orientation is that in different situations the objectives and the slogans change. A classic example is the slogan concerning the struggle for peace. Lenin, during the first world war, always rejected the slogan for the struggle for peace. The objective which he set for the workers movement was to transform the imperialist war into civil war. Thus he broke with pacifists' propaganda, having reached the correct conclusion that the imperialist war had created conditions such as had been set and that the problem of taking power on behalf of the working classes and on behalf of the socialist revolution could have been resolved. Having come to power and having founded the soviet state, Lenin's position changed. The objective and the slogan concerning the conquest, the maintenance and the struggle for peace then became the main goals of the working classes and of the Soviet leaders. It is sufficient to think of the polemic with Trotsky concerning the peace of Brest-Litovsk; it is sufficient to reread the writing in which Lenin

(More)

UNCLASSIFIED

Attachment to Item #283 (Cont.,) UNCLASSIFIED

formulated for the first time the doctrine for the peaceful coexistence of states with different political and social systems, to understand the enormous range of this change. Peaceful coexistence is necessary in order to maintain peace. Peace is an essential and vital objective for the working classes which have come into power. What are the changes which have taken place in the current situation which permit us to affirm that war not only must but can be avoided? I wish to call your attention to two changes of great importance: the nature of war has changed and the balance of power between socialism and imperialism has changed.

Beware of not taking into consideration the new characteristics which war has assumed today. We run the risk of being at least a generation behind in our opinions concerning war and peace. Wars of the past - even the last war - have been such that it was still possible to make a certain distinction between combatants on the firing line and the non-combatants. Today the distinction is no longer possible. Everyone is on the same front, directly on the death line. As a result of the deadly character of atomic clouds, even the people's of countries which are not at war find themselves on the death line. In the second place, the present military weapons of mass destruction are such that their use will cause the total destruction of all the centers of human civilization, as well as of animal and vegetable life, making impossible for a period which today is not calculable to undertake any human activity whatsoever. In the third place, since these means of total destruction are in the possessions of both sides, it is not possible for whoever starts a war to evaluate what may be the consequences to him self. War can become suicide for whoever starts it. If the United States makes a surprise attack it might succeed in inflicting incalculable damage on the socialist countries. However, it would suffer greater damage itself. If there were total destruction on the one side, there would be total destruction on the other. All this changes the nature of war and therefore should induce us to think and to reconsider our doctrine of peace and war. Our distinction between just and unjust wars remains absolutely valid. When it is a question of defending one's liberty, national independence, the socialist cause, the combat is just and we fight to win. If tomorrow there were a world-wide conflict, we know well that the right would be on the side not of imperialism but of the socialist countries which systematically fought, is fighting and will fight for peace. However, if we take into account the total destruction which would take place on both sides, it is evident that other considerations must be added to that of whether or not the war is just. Let us imagine that 20 or 30 nuclear bombs, sufficient to create total destruction and a desert, were to fall on our country. What type of socialism could ever be constructed in these conditions? We would be lying to the people if we said that by means of a war, today, we could attain socialism. We must tell the truth, that is that if we wish to keep the road to socialism open to the Italian people, we must do what is necessary to avoid war.

Our struggle for peace has a profoundly human character. We, the representatives of the class which tomorrow will govern the entire world, understand more and better than all the others the terrible menace which today hangs over mankind; we want to save that patrimony of civilization which has accumulated throughout the centuries; we devote all our strength to the maintenance of life and civilization, adding to that patrimony, developing it, transforming it. This was the inner meaning of the appeal which we made several years ago to the Catholics. And that appeal which penetrated deeply in the spirit of millions of men.

If we now proceed to examine the relative strength of imperialism and socialism, we note that here also such a change has occurred that the situation in no way resembles what it was 50 years ago.

Attachment to Item #283 (Cont.) UNCLASSIFIED

Until 1917, imperialism never was confronted with a socialist country. When it began to be confronted by a socialist country, it scorned it and for a long time considered it a negligible phenomenon which would not exercise any influence on world politics. Hitler thought that with one of his blitzkriegs he could clean up this country and we all know how Hitler finished. But we know how many sacrifices, how many losses, how much grief the victory over Hitlerism cost the Soviet people. Today the Soviet Union, in comparison with the strength it possessed in 1935, has made a great step forward. Today other socialist countries exist, the immense Chinese People's republic which is also becoming an industrialized country, the entire Eastern Europe which is progressing toward socialism. Henceforth, one can count the years which separate us from the moment when the weight of socialist industry will be superior on the world scales to the weight of capitalist industry, to the industry which is at the disposition of imperialism. Already today, everyone realizes that the socialist world is superior militarily and it is for this reason, moreover, that the Americans say they are convinced that in a war with the Soviet Union they would not succeed in defeating it. This is shown clearly by Eisenhower's statement that in the case of war between the US and the Soviet Union there would be neither victor nor vanquished. It is impossible not to take all this into account in considering whether war can be avoided. Forces of the socialist camp are, in fact, entirely committed to avoiding war.

It was necessary to take into account the political consequences of this basic change in the balance of power. The important thing is that there are no longer in the world spheres of influence reserved for imperialism. Its colonial outposts have collapsed. Throughout the world the influence of the socialist countries, and in particular of the Soviet Union, is expanding. The other day, one of the most impudent and ridiculous mercenaries of American imperialism wrote in a Torino newspaper that the principal enemy of peace is today none other than Khrushchev because he makes heard the voice of the Soviet Union on all international problems and particularly regarding the Congo and Cuba! What a scandal! Socialism is invading the hunting preserve reserved for imperialism! Well, henceforth all must take into account this new reality.

There is no international political problem which can be treated without taking into consideration the existence of the socialist countries and their energetic defense of peace. Cuba, the Congo, the liberty of the African peoples, disarmament are questions which are being examined and resolved, all of them in the light of this new balance of power. Their increasing prestige, is no longer the only factor contributing to the peace policy of the socialist countries. There is also their material strength capable of imposing itself on the imperialist aggressors and driving them back. It is for this reason that, during the last years, we have seen France and England decisively defeated in their aggression against Egypt; we have seen the United States placed in a position where it was impossible for them to conduct their aggressive undertakings against Lebanon and Iraq. It is for this reason that the United States has not been able to treat Cuba like it treated Guatemala a few years ago. It is for this reason that the Congo can hope that an end will be put to Belgian aggression.

This is the new fact of international life. This does not mean that international life has become calmer. Conflicts exist, differences and disputes remain; imperialist aggression continues to manifest itself; but the balance of power has shifted and continues uninterruptedly to change in favor of the socialist camp and to the detriment of imperialism. In the imperialist camp, as a result of this very situation, new contradictions and conflicts have arisen which can facilitate the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence.

Attachment to Item #283 (Cont.) UNCLASSIFIED

When we state that war can be avoided, are we saying something which contradicts the affirmation concerning the necessity for a struggle against imperialism? Not at all. On the contrary, we say that war can be avoided in proportion to the degree in which we succeed through mobilizing public opinion, through struggles and manifestations of solidarity among peoples throughout the world, in isolating the captains of imperialism and fighting against them. The two things, therefore, are closely related. Only one who reasons schematically outside reality, could not perceive this relationship.

Thus, when we say that war can be avoided we do not create any illusions among the masses, since at the same time we summon them to struggle to avoid war. Undoubtedly we raise hopes, but these are hopes in the victory of peace and of world socialism which must be raised. They are legitimate hopes which arising from the great step and the continuous strengthening of socialism throughout the world.

The important thing is that the objective which we set and for which we summon people to struggle, i.e., for detente, peaceful coexistence, disarmament and for peace are considered by us to be real objectives, that is to say, objectives which can be realized. If this were not the case, if we did not believe in the possibility of avoiding war, in what name would we conduct the struggle for detente, disarmament and for peaceful coexistence? Certainly in such a case we would be fooling the masses and there would be duplicity in our struggle. But we are not deceiving anybody and we are not deceiving ourselves, because our positions result from a serious and correct appraisal of the real balance of power. The forces of peace are beginning to prevail. Let us work and struggle so that they continue to prevail and so that war will be outlawed.

The second question that is being argued today is the possibility of peaceful progress toward socialism. Let us begin by stating that which we have always affirmed - and it is one of the fundamental theses of Marxism - that it is not necessary to have wars in order to have revolutionary movements. It is true that victory in Russia followed the First World War; that the subsequent advances of socialism in other countries were the result of other conflicts; but we do not believe that this is a law; on the contrary we claim the opposite. The movement and struggle of the masses can bring the working classes into power without war; even civil war. This last statement is made on the same basis, or at least on an analogous basis, to that which permits us to affirm that war can be avoided; that is beginning with the fact of the new balance of power which has been established between capitalism and socialism with all the consequences that you know and which we have indicated many times. Naturally, the specific problem does not arise in the same way everywhere and the contributing factors are varied. There are international factors such as the increased importance of socialist societies on the world scene as opposed to the capitalist societies. The victories of socialism throughout the world open the road for socialism in all countries. But national factors must also be considered. Throughout the development of the democratic struggle, throughout the economic and political victories of the working classes and the people's masses, the very working and laboring classes which succeed in gradually increasing their political and moral weight within the framework of a national society. In this manner it is possible to create conditions favorably for a transition to socialism by peaceful means.

It is obvious that under fascism such a possibility could not be considered. Fascism had to be defeated, this was the basic requisite for advancing. And in order to defeat it we took up arms and fought. But the liberation from fascism has been completed in a way that has left the deepest indelible marks on Italian

(More)

Attachment to Item #283 (Cont.) UNCLASSIFIED

society, its struggle, in its organization and, above all, in the spirit of the majority of its people. Today, everybody agrees on the significance of these marks. Specifically, a democratic climate has been created in which it is possible to organize and conduct a victorious struggle for basic reforms in the political and economic structure of the country. This democratic climate and this opportunity were won in the anti-facist struggle. For this reason we stated, at our 9th Congress, that the socialist revolution in Italy must be an anti-facist revolution. Thus, it is a question of advancing a large movement which has already allowed us to effect basic victories and which had and still has a program of demands which if put into effect would bring a profound regeneration of our entire society. In this case, too, success depends on the revolutionary work and on the struggle of the masses. However, the possibilities which previously had to be excluded, today can no longer be excluded. They exist and the working class must know how to fully exploit them to assure that its progress toward socialism develops with a minimum of grief, by peaceful means. I should like to reason analogically, using an example that has a certain significance. Who would ever have thought, 50 years ago, before the 1st World War, when the entire world lay under imperialists dominion, that India, for example, would gain its independence without civil war? That, almost without civil war, Indonesia would become independent? That, a large number of African countries would become independent without engaging in civil wars? 50 years ago the Marxists would not have made such statements since the conditions then were fundamentally different from what they are today. However, today these things have taken place, and we know very well that they have been realized because there was a victorious October Revolution because the Chinese Revolution was successful, because World War II was won, thanks to the decisive contribution of the Soviet Union and because a system of socialist states was developed and strengthened. When the structure of the world changes, the course of history also changes.

Naturally, when someone asks whether we are sure that there will be a peaceful development, whether we exclude the use of force by the bourgeoisie which would oblige the working class to fight with all its means, our reply is very simple. We know what the bourgeoisie is. We know its methods and its intentions and in particular the intentions of the most reactionary bourgeois group. These things oblige us always to keep our eyes open. However, we are also aware of the general conditions in which the class struggle and the political struggle are developing today. They are such that they allow us to consider as a real possibility the advance towards socialism working in a democratic climate as purely parliamentary debate and exchange of opinion in the newspapers would be making a serious mistake. A democratic climate is that in which the masses of Japanese workers moved the last few weeks in order to tear up the Japanese-American Treaty. A democratic climate is that in which the workers and the students in Korea operated in order to chase Sigman Rhee. A democratic climate is that in which the Italian workers, intellectuals and the youth moved to repel the menace of facism. A democratic climate such as that in which the peace struggle is evolving is climate of widespread mass actions, the agitation of public opinion and the establishment by the vanguard of the working class, of objectives which can be accomplished through action. These matters were discussed fully during the recent congress and there is no need to repeat them.

I wanted to clarify these matters so that the position our party maintains in the debates about these problems would be clear. The international Communist movement must have a clear position and a correct comprehension of the present

(More)

Attachment to Item #283 (Cont.) UNCLASSIFIED

situation. This is the point of departure for every extension and development of Marxism. Moreover, the unity of our ranks must be firm and grow stronger. Each weakening of this unity will be dearly paid for, not only by us, but the entire world. The peace policy of the Soviet Union is the policy of the entire workers and socialist movement, of all socialist countries and of all progressive mankind. This unity is the best guarantee of our success.

(The End)